

THE SUNDAY JOURNAL

SUNDAY, JANUARY 5, 1896.

Washington Office—1410 Pennsylvania Avenue

Telephone Calls.

Business Office, 238 Editorial Rooms, A. B.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

DAILY BY MAIL.

Daily only, one month, \$2.00

Daily only, three months, \$5.00

Daily only, six months, \$9.00

Daily only, one year, \$16.00

Daily, including Sunday, one year, \$18.00

Sunday only, one year, \$6.00

When furnished by agents.

Daily, per week, by carrier, 15 cts

Single copy, 5 cts

Daily and Sunday, per annum, \$1.00

Per year, \$1.00

Reduced Rates to Clubs.

Subscriptions to any of our numerous agents or send

subscriptions to the

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,

Indianapolis, Ind.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the

United States should get on a right-size paper, a

first-class postage stamp, on a twelve or sixteen-page

paper, a two-cent postage stamp. Foreign postage is

usually double these rates.

All communications intended for publication in this

paper must, in order to receive attention, be accom-

panied by the name and address of the writer.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL

Can be found at the following places:

PAUL & AMERICAN EXCHANGE, 36 Boulevard de

Capeville.

NEW YORK—Giles House, Auditor Hotel and Astor

Hotel.

CINCINNATI—Palmer House, Auditorium Hotel and P.

O. News Co., 9 Adams street.

CINCINNATI—J. R. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine street.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner of

Third and Jefferson streets, and Louisville Book Co., 350

North 4th st.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House, Ebbitt House,

Willard Hotel and the Washington News Exchange,

1111 14th st., bet. Penn. ave. and 5th street.

—Sixteen Pages—

WARNING AGAINST A FRAUD.

A man, calling himself F. E. Taylor and

other aliases, is traveling about in the gas

bet, representing himself as a general agent

of the Journal and collecting money for

subscriptions from unsuspecting persons. He

is a fraud and unworthy of any confidence.

The description given of him is that he is

about five feet four inches in height, weighs

about 125 pounds, is smooth shaven, except

a close-cropped, gray mustache, wears a

cutaway coat and soft hat, and looks to be

about fifty years of age. All persons are

warned not to pay money for the Journal

to him, or any one else, unless at their

own risk. The only traveling agent the

Journal has, who is authorized to collect

money, is Mr. William Smith King, and he

carries credentials that are unmistakable.

It would tend to promote good feeling

among the nations if Great Britain

would go out of the land-grabbing busi-

ness.

Ex-Tammany Sachem Croker, who is in

Tennessee looking after blooded horses,

says he is forever out of politics. Politi-

cis is to be congratulated.

The evidences of panic inside the Span-

ish lines in Cuba indicate a lack of con-

fidence in leaders and rulers which is

quite as demoralizing as the loss of a

battle.

Circumstances alter cases. That Irish-

man in Chicago who thinks British rule

should be established in the Transvaal

country doubtless thinks it should be

abolished in Ireland.

The street car troubles in Philadel-

phia seem to be mainly due to the schem-

ing of professional agitators whose stock

in trade is stirring up strife between

employers and employees.

Mr. Alfred Austin, poet laureate, is

likely to find plenty of room in the late

Mr. Alfred Tennyson's shoes. After he

has stuffed all his neat little verses into

the toes there will still be no danger of

pinching.

In his message Governor Greenhalge,

of Massachusetts, told the Legislature

that woman suffrage need not earnestly

engage its attention this year, and the

House has abolished the standing com-

mittee on that subject.

It is excellent policy for the Cuban

insurgents to wear out their unaccom-

one-fourth as numerous. Probably the

reason is that postmasters, on the whole,

are selected with greater care than city

and county officers.

NEWS THROUGH A ROUNDABOUT

CHANNEL.

The American correspondent of the

London Daily Chronicle seems to be get-

ting some interesting information at

Washington which the correspondents

of American newspapers have either

overlooked or have not been able to ob-

tain. His publication of the official

correspondence between the governments

of Great Britain and Venezuela during

the period between November, 1894, when

the so-called Schomburgk line was first

laid down, and April, 1895, when it was

formally abandoned by Great Britain,

was a very important contribution to

the literature of the case, and fully jus-

tified his conclusion that "if the docu-

ments are genuine the Schomburgk line

is proved worthless as a basis for any

territorial claim." The correspondent

must have obtained access to this cor-

respondence either from the Department

of State or from the Venezuelan minis-

ter at Washington, most likely from the

latter. The State Department could only

have obtained it in confidence through

Venezuelan channels, and in that

case would hardly give it out for

publication. The Venezuelan minis-

ter would have recognized its im-

portant bearing on the controversy

and might have thought it would have

more effect if brought out in London

than if published first in Washington.

The correspondent gives no clew to how

he obtained the information beyond say-

ing that it is official, as the dates and

extracts given by him clearly show, and

that the source from which the docu-

ments were obtained "excludes any sus-

picion as to their genuineness."

The publication of this correspondence

has proved a genuine surprise to the

English public, which is not accustomed

to the revelation of state secrets. The

Chronicle calls it "a momentous dis-

patch," and in reply to the criticism

that it is "correct as far as it goes, but

is only a part of the correspondence" it

says: "If the Foreign Office possesses

evidence to strengthen Lord Salisbury's

position, surely it is time it was pub-

lished." Under such goading as this

Lord Salisbury will be almost compelled

to give out the whole correspondence.

That which is already published prac-

tically demolishes the British claim and

throws him out of court. Unless its

effect can be broken by the publication

of the whole correspondence it is con-

clusive of the controversy.

Another interesting fact is brought out

by the Chronicle correspondent in the

following:

The Bering sea commission declared that

America should not insist on a line of

commission to determine the damages. Sec-

retary Gresham made it clear that the as-

sent of Congress was essentially to the

President. Congress, in spite of President

Cleveland's pressure, refused. The presi-

dent's message of Dec. 3 last said that if

Congress still declined to affirm the award

it certainly will hardly consider the

proposition that government is bound by

every consideration of honor and good

faith to provide for a speedy adjustment

of these claims by arbitration as the only

other alternative. A treaty of arbitration

was drawn up, discussed, approved by

America, by Canada, and by the British

embassador here. Where is it? It is de-

claring in London in the hands of the

British government. Meanwhile, the Pres-

ident is unable to keep his promise to

Congress, and must soon make awkward

conclusion of this treaty is demanded by

the effect upon the public opinion of both

countries. The British government, while

another is hanging fire, and by the

proof it would afford of the absence of

wellness of feeling here and of the sym-

pathetic attitude of England.

The opening sentence of this statement

is a mistake. The Bering sea commis-

sion did not "declare that the United

States should pay \$25,000 or appoint a

commission to determine the damages."

The finding of the commission settled

to obtain a stipulation in the treaty that

she should control the lakes. The United

States refused to concede that, and our

peace commissioners asked for a mutual

disarmament. During the negotiations

one of our commissioners wrote that it

would be wise to stipulate that neither

party should maintain naval vessels on

the lakes nor forts along the shores, for,

he said, "if England had forty ships of

the line and a dozen Gibraltar we could

easily take Canada." This letter was

published and made England very loath

to accept the proposition for mutual

disarmament. The British authorities

of that day believed that Canada was in

great danger of being taken by this

country in the event of war, and they

held out strongly against reducing their

naval force on the lakes. Finally, how-

ever, they yielded, and in 1817 an agree-

ment was entered into by which the

naval force of each government on the

lakes should consist of four vessels, one

on Lake Champlain, one on Lake On-

ta and two on the upper lakes, each

vessel not to exceed one hundred tons

burden and to be armed only with one

eighteen-pound gun. It was provided

that all other armed vessels on the lakes

should be dismantled and no others

built or armed on these waters, but that

either party could secure abrogation of

the agreement by giving six months' notice.

This agreement has been in

force since 1817, and there has been no

friction to speak of regarding it. In

case of war it would, of course, be abro-

gated, as all treaties are, and then it would

be a race between the two governments as

to which should get control of the lakes.

In a race of that kind the United States

would be apt to hold her own.

It is understood that the measure re-

cently introduced by Senator Squire

providing for coast defenses includes

some points on the lakes where better

fortifications are required. If this is the

case it will probably be necessary for

the United States to give the six months' notice required by the agreement of 1817

for its abrogation.

THE INDEFINITE OLOGY.

There were those who hoped that the

economists, at the late meeting in this

city, would have contributed something

to relieve that branch of economics called

sociology of the vagueness which has

characterized the expressions of the

most of those who have attempted to

discuss the subject. Such hope was not

realized. It was talked about, was the

subject of lectures, and yet its bound-

aries are as vague as before, and the

aims of its professors are just as in-

definite. In a vague manner the lead-

ing speaker talked of the general un-

certainty of the masses and the prevalence

of the opinion that most people did not